

Elastic stars in general relativity: IV. Axial perturbations

Max Karlovini^{1*} and Lars Samuelsson^{2†}

¹ Department of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Masaryk University,
Kotlarska 2, 611 37 Brno, Czech Republic

² School of Mathematics, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK

This is the fourth paper in a series that attempt to put forward a consistent framework for modelling solid regions in neutron stars. Here we turn our attention to axial perturbations of spherically symmetric spacetimes using a gauge invariant approach due to one of us. Using the formalism developed in the first paper in the series it turns out that the matter perturbations are neatly expressible in terms of a “metric” tensor field depending only on the speeds of shear wave propagation along the principal directions in the solid. The results are applicable to a wide class of elastic materials and does not assume material isotropy nor quasi-Hookean behaviour. The perturbation equations are then specialised to a static background and are given by two coupled wave equations. Our formalism is thus slightly simpler than the previously existing results of Shumaker & Thorne, where an additional initial value equation needs to be solved. The simplification is mainly due to the gauge invariance of our approach and shows up also in somewhat simpler boundary conditions. We also give a first order formulation suitable for numerical integration of the quasi-normal mode problem of a neutron star. The relations between the gauge independent variables and the, in general, gauge dependent perturbed metric and strain tensor are explicitly given.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

In recent years it has become increasingly clear that, in order to extract information from observations of neutron stars, we must first understand the dynamical behaviour of matter beyond the perfect fluid approximation. Much effort have been put in to understand *e.g.* the dynamics of superfluids including various viscous phenomena, see [1] for a recent review. This topic is essential in order to realistically discuss *e.g.* glitches and gravitational waves arising from secular instabilities. These events may also require understanding of magnetic interactions if the field is strong enough to influence the dynamics in the region where the matter currents are strong. This is certainly the case at least in the outer layers of magnetars and the outermost crust in pulsars but may even be important in the interior regions if the magnetic field is buried during the formation of the star. Glitches will require a thorough understanding of the behaviour of the rigid parts of the star and its interactions with normal and super-fluids. Recently a formalism was presented [4] suited for handling elastic solids permeated by a superfluids, including, in a MHD like manner, magnetic fields.

*E-mail: max@physics.muni.cz

†E-mail: lars@soton.ac.uk

The objective of this series of papers is to develop a coherent framework for purely elastic components in compact objects. In this, the fourth paper, we consider axial perturbations of spherical stars. It is worth pointing out that axial oscillations in neutron stars may already have been observed in the aftermath of giant flares in soft gamma ray repeaters, where quasi periodic oscillations with frequencies from 18 Hz reaching into the kHz range are observed [13, 30, 33, 2, 31]. Although the enormous magnetic fields believed to be present in these objects, which are well modelled within the so-called magnetar model [10], will couple any torsional oscillations to the core within about one oscillation period via Alfvén waves [12, 19] a recent toy-model suggests [12] that the frequencies will nevertheless be close to the purely elastic ones. Therefore, even in this type of systems, it is important to understand the elastic oscillation spectrum. This spectrum has recently been studied, within the relativistic Cowling approximation, in [26]. The local magnetic effects (*i.e.* neglecting the global nature of the modes) of the torsional mode spectrum has been studied for a poloidal dipole field [28] (see also [22]). These calculations were recently extended to include purely axial global oscillations [29].

The Newtonian theory of axial perturbations of elastic bodies is well developed, see *e.g.* [21]. The general relativistic problem was pioneered by Schumaker and Thorne [27] (hereafter ST) who developed a detailed theory including many relevant limits. Our treatment is different from theirs in several important ways. First, we use the gauge invariant perturbation formalism due to one of us [14]. This formalism assumes that the perturbations are axisymmetric, but as discussed *e.g.* in [6], this implies no restriction for spherically symmetric backgrounds. At a practical level, the difference between our and ST’s approach shows up in the fact that our final equations consist of just two coupled wave equations and thereby dispenses of the additional initial value equation, being traceable to the gauge choice, in ST. Moreover, the formalism applies to any spherically symmetric (static or not) background. More importantly, our treatment does not from the outset assume an isotropic background which makes it applicable to the exotic (“nuclear pasta”) phases believed to exist in the lower crust of the neutron star (*e.g.* [24]). Another minor difference is that our formalism in the main part of this work is valid for non-linear elastic equations of state. That is, we do not assume a quasi-Hookean equation of state from the outset. Practically this should not be very important since the behaviour of perfect elasticity (which we do assume) is likely to break down roughly when any nonlinear corrections to quasi-Hookean behaviour become important.

As mentioned above, our treatment will not be limited to isotropic backgrounds. There are two fundamentally different cases in which non-isotropy occur, either the material is intrinsically non-isotropic (as in the pasta phases) or the star is already strained. One may think that the latter is fairly unimportant since, at any given time, the crust will be close to its unstrained state simply because it will break otherwise. However, the same limitations that apply to the background applies to the perturbations so that the background strain may well be of the same order as (or larger than!) the oscillations. An example where this may be important is provided by the flare model of Duncan [9] where the initial crust quake sends seismic waves in the (already strained) crust thereby causing it to fracture at other locations too.

The treatment relies heavily on Paper I in the series [15] (hereafter Paper I), where the theoretical foundations of relativistic elasticity were outlined following the framework of Carter and Quintana [3]. For convenience and in order to introduce notation a brief review of the formalism of Paper I is given below.

1.2 Relativity

Any description of continuous media is, at least implicitly, based on the use of an abstract base manifold, the matter space, X say. This space (which in our case is three dimensional and Riemannian) can be thought of as a book-keeping tool which assigns unique labels to each fluid element via a map Ψ that takes each flow-line on spacetime (M say) to a point in matter space. We may use this map to push-forward the contravariant metric g^{ab} on M to X ,

$$g^{AB} = \Psi_* g^{ab}, \quad (1)$$

where abstract index notation [32] with capital letters on X and lower case letters on M is adopted. We then define the tensor η^{-1AB} to be the value of g^{AB} that minimises the energy density at a fixed number density n . We now define η_{AB} through the relation $\eta^{-1AC}\eta_{CB} = \delta^A_B$. Pulling back η_{AB} to M ($\eta_{ab} = \Psi^*\eta_{AB}$) we

may define the constant volume strain tensor according to

$$s_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}(h_{ab} - \eta_{ab}), \quad (2)$$

where h_{ab} is defined by $h_{ab} = g_{ab} + u_a u_b$ with u^a being the unit tangent vector to the flow-lines. Thus, in effect, s_{ab} measures the difference in geometry between the natural, unsheared state and the actual physical state.

In this paper we will use the simplifying assumption that the elastic structure deforms conformally under pure compression. As discussed in Paper I this allows us to fully describe this structure by a fixed (*i.e.* n -independent) metric tensor field $k_{AB} = n^{2/3} \eta_{AB}$ on X . One may think of this metric as measuring the relative positions of the particles in a locally relaxed state.

Using the fact that the eigenvectors of $k_{ab} = \Psi^* k_{AB}$ are eigenvectors also of the stress tensor p_{ab} a preferred tetrad completed by the matter four-velocity u^a may be introduced. Denoting the eigenvectors by e_μ^a we use Greek indices to numerate the space-like basis vectors. The eigenvalues n_μ^2 of k_{ab} correspond, in a loose sense, to (squared) linear particle densities, whereas the eigenvalues p_μ of the strain tensor are the pressures as measured by a comoving observer in the direction of e_μ^a .

1.3 Perturbation theory and notational remarks

We shall assume that there exist a family of solutions to Einstein's equations, parametrised by λ say¹. We assume that the solution for a specific λ (equal to zero say) to be known and expand around this solution. We take δ in front of any tensor field to represent the value of $d/d\lambda$ on that field evaluated at $\lambda = 0$. We shall have occasion to define perturbed quantities without the explicit perturbation symbol δ . The indices on such quantities are raised and lowered by the unperturbed spacetime metric, whereas care must be exercised when fields have retained the δ , *e.g.*

$$\delta e_\mu^a = \delta(g^{ab} e_{\mu b}) \neq g^{ab} \delta e_{\mu b}. \quad (3)$$

In order not to have too cluttered formulae we shall not notationally distinguish background fields from the full family fields but instead point out the validity of the equations in the text when confusion may arise.

In order to conform with the notation in the preceding papers in this series[15, 17, 16] as well as with the work of Karlovini[14] on which much of this paper is based, we use some non-standard notation. In particular, the perturbed metric will be denoted by γ_{ab} and the flow-line orthogonal piece of the metric is denoted by h_{ab} , *i.e.* precisely the opposite of the definitions in *e.g.* [5].

We will use geometric units such that $c = 1$, $G = 1$ and the Einstein equations take the form

$$Z_{ab} := R_{ab} - \kappa(T_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}T^c{}_c g_{ab}) = 0 \quad (4)$$

where R_{ab} is the Ricci tensor, T_{ab} is the energy momentum tensor and κ is the coupling constant which, in conventional units, takes the value $\kappa = 8\pi G c^{-4}$.

2 General perturbations

Perturbation theory of elastic media has already been considered by Carter in some detail in [5]. Since it seems computationally advantageous to use the eigenvalue formulation in many practical situations we shall devote this section to deriving the perturbations of the eigenvectors and from that deducing the perturbed stress energy tensor. The derivation is performed in an arbitrary (identification) gauge and the final expression reduces to the formulae of Carter when either a Lagrangian or a Eulerian gauge (given by some displacement vector field ξ^a) is chosen. Since we are assuming a perfectly elastic conformally deforming material (so we

¹We leave aside the technical, but important, issue of existence of such a family. On physical grounds, for the applications in mind in this paper, it is apparent that such a family should exist.

have a fixed matter space metric k_{AB}) we shall consider the perturbed matter space and spacetime metrics to be our fundamental variables.

The perturbed eigenvectors are easily derived from the identities

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ab} u^a u^b &= -1, & g_{ab} u^a e_\mu^b &= 0, & g_{ab} e_\mu^a e_\nu^b &= \delta_{\mu\nu}, \\ k_{ab} u^a u^b &= 0, & k_{ab} u^a e_\mu^b &= 0, & k_{ab} e_\mu^a e_\nu^b &= n_\mu^2 \delta_{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned}$$

which, when perturbed, yield

$$u^a u^b \gamma_{ab} + 2u_a \delta u^a = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$u^a e_\mu^b \gamma_{ab} + e_{\mu a} \delta u^a + u_a \delta e_\mu^a = 0 \quad (6)$$

$$e_\mu^a e_\nu^b \gamma_{ab} + e_{\mu a} \delta e_\nu^a + e_{\nu a} \delta e_\mu^a = 0 \quad (7)$$

$$u^a u^b \delta k_{ab} = 0 \quad (8)$$

$$u^a e_\mu^b \delta k_{ab} + n_\mu^2 e_{\mu a} \delta u^a = 0 \quad (9)$$

$$e_\mu^a e_\nu^b \delta k_{ab} + n_\mu^2 e_{\mu a} \delta e_\nu^a + n_\nu^2 e_{\nu a} \delta e_\mu^a = \delta(n_\mu^2) \delta_{\mu\nu}, \quad (10)$$

where $\gamma_{ab} = \delta g_{ab}$. Solving for δu^a , δe_μ^a and $\delta(n_\mu^2)$ gives

$$\delta u^a = \frac{1}{2} u^b u^c \gamma_{bc} u^a - \sum_{\mu=1}^3 n_\mu^{-2} u^b e_\mu^c \delta k_{bc} e_\mu^a \quad (11)$$

$$\delta e_\mu^a = -\frac{1}{n_\mu^2} u^b e_\mu^c (\delta k_{bc} - n_\mu^2 \gamma_{ab}) u^a - \frac{1}{2} e_\mu^b e_\mu^c \gamma_{bc} e_\mu^a + \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{1}{n_\mu^2 - n_\nu^2} e_\mu^b e_\nu^c (\delta k_{bc} - n_\mu^2 \gamma_{bc}) e_\nu^a \quad (12)$$

$$\delta(n_\mu^2) = e_\mu^a e_\mu^b (\delta k_{ab} - n_\mu^2 \gamma_{ab}). \quad (13)$$

The perturbed basis one-forms are similarly found to be,

$$\delta u_a = -\frac{1}{2} u^b u^c \gamma_{bc} u_a - \sum_{\mu=1}^3 n_\mu^{-2} u^b e_\mu^c (\delta k_{bc} - n_\mu^2 \gamma_{bc}) e_{\mu a} \quad (14)$$

$$\delta e_{\mu a} = -n_\mu^{-2} u^b e_\mu^c \delta k_{bc} u_a + \frac{1}{2} e_\mu^b e_\mu^c \gamma_{bc} e_{\mu a} - \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{1}{n_\nu^2 - n_\mu^2} e_\nu^b e_\mu^c (\delta k_{bc} - n_\nu^2 \gamma_{bc}) e_{\nu a} \quad (15)$$

One may be worried that the difference between the linear number densities that appear in the denominator in the expressions (12) and (15) will cause divergences when there are degenerate eigenvalues on the background. However, as we will see, for the physical quantities relevant for this work, the sums are always convergent. These relations makes it a simple (but tedious) task to write down the perturbations of any tensor field in terms of the perturbed metrics. In particular the general perturbation of the stress energy tensor takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \delta T_{ab} &= (\delta \rho - \rho u^c u^d \gamma_{cd}) u_a u_b + \sum_{\mu=1}^3 (\delta p_\mu + p_\mu e_\mu^c e_\mu^d \gamma_{cd}) e_{\mu a} e_{\mu b} - 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^3 u^c e_\mu^d [n_\mu^{-2} (\rho + p_\mu) \delta k_{cd} - \rho \gamma_{cd}] u_{(a} e_{\mu b)} \\ &+ \sum_{\mu=1}^3 \sum_{\nu \neq \mu}^3 e_\mu^c e_\nu^d [n_\nu^{-2} (\rho + p_\nu) v_{\mu\perp\nu}^2 (\delta k_{cd} - n_\nu^2 \gamma_{cd}) + p_\nu \gamma_{cd}] e_{\mu(a} e_{\nu b)} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $v_{\mu\perp\nu}$ is the speed of shear waves along the μ -direction with polarisation vector along the ν -direction,

$$(\rho + p_\nu) v_{\mu\perp\nu}^2 = \frac{n_\nu^2 (p_\nu - p_\mu)}{n_\nu^2 - n_\mu^2} \quad (17)$$

as derived in Paper I. It is now apparent that the isotropic limit is well defined. The perturbed energy density and eigenpressures can also be expressed in terms of the perturbed metrics by the use of (13) (remembering that the equation of state is considered to be given as a function of the linear particle densities) as

$$\delta\rho = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu} (\rho + p_{\mu}) n_{\mu}^{-2} (\delta k_{ab} - n_{\mu}^2 \gamma_{ab}) e_{\mu}^a e_{\mu}^b \quad (18)$$

$$\delta p_{\mu} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu} n_{\nu} \frac{\partial p_{\mu}}{\partial n_{\nu}} n_{\nu}^{-2} (\delta k_{ab} - n_{\nu}^2 \gamma_{ab}) e_{\nu}^a e_{\nu}^b \quad (19)$$

$$(20)$$

However, these will be seen to vanish for the axial case which is the main concern of this paper. One can confirm that, by comparing these relations to the expression for the elasticity tensor given in Paper I, one obtains the expression given by Carter [5], a calculation that is best done in a Lagrangian gauge for which $u^a \delta k_{ab}$ vanish.

3 Axial perturbations

We shall now specialise our considerations to axial (in a sense to be defined) perturbations. We use the approach of Karlovini [14]. For convenience, and to introduce notation, we briefly review this formalism below and then proceed to specialise it to perfectly elastic matter.

Consider a spacetime with a Killing vector field η^a . If this Killing vector field is nearly hyper-surface orthogonal, *i.e.* its twist

$$\Omega^a = -\epsilon^{abcd} \eta_b \nabla_c \eta_d \quad (21)$$

can be considered to be small, we may treat the deviation from hyper-surface orthogonality as a perturbation. Note that this general considerations allows, as examples, studies of axisymmetric almost spherical systems as well as stationary almost static systems (with no required symmetry on the space-like hyper-surfaces). The main focus in this paper is the spherical case, so that η^a is the axisymmetry generator and reduces to one of the SO(3) generators on the background. In order to make progress we split the metric according to

$$g_{ab} = \perp_{ab} + F \mu_a \mu_b, \quad (22)$$

where

$$F = \eta^a \eta_a, \quad \mu_a = F^{-1} \eta_a, \quad \eta^a \perp_{ab} = 0 \quad (23)$$

On a spherical background the function squared norm of the Killing vector has the form $F = (r \sin \theta)^2$. The polar and axial perturbations of the spacetime metric² are given by

$$^+ \gamma_{ab} = (\perp_a^c \perp_b^d + \mu_a \mu_b \eta^c \eta^d) \gamma_{cd} = \delta \perp_{ab} + (\delta F) \mu_a \mu_b \quad (24)$$

$$^- \gamma_{ab} = 2\eta^c \mu_{(a} \perp_{b)}^d \gamma_{cd} = 2\eta_{(a} \delta \mu_{b)}. \quad (25)$$

Taking the appropriate projections of Einstein's equations,

$$\perp^{ac} \perp^{bd} Z_{ab} = 0 \quad (26)$$

$$\eta^a \eta^b Z_{ab} = 0 \quad (27)$$

$$\perp^{ab} \eta^c Z_{ab} = 0 \quad (28)$$

and using a partial identification gauge fixing amounting to

$$\delta \eta^a = 0 \quad (29)$$

²Note that the terms 'axial' and 'polar' will be inappropriate for perturbations of non-spherical spacetimes.

it is possible to show [14] that, when evaluated at $\Omega^a = 0$, the axial part of the metric (25) satisfies (26) and (27) identically, whereas the polar part (24) satisfies (28) identically. Hence these perturbations decouple and may be treated separately.

We henceforth restrict ourselves to the axial case whence

$$\delta \perp_{ab} = 0, \quad \delta F = 0, \quad (30)$$

so that

$$\gamma_{ab} = -\gamma_{ab} = 2\eta_{(a}\delta\mu_{b)} \quad (31)$$

We next introduce the notation

$$Q_{ab} = 2\nabla_{[a}\delta\mu_{b]}, \quad J^a = 2\delta(\perp^{ab}\eta^c T_{bc}) \quad (32)$$

as well as their (restricted) duals

$$Q^a = -\frac{1}{2}F\epsilon^{abcd}\eta_b Q_{cd}, \quad J_{ab} = \epsilon_{abcd}J^c\eta^d \quad (33)$$

Note that both the perturbation vectors Q^a and J^a (as well as their duals) are gauge invariant since the corresponding background quantities vanish. In terms of these fields the full perturbation equations takes the Maxwell-like form [14]

$$\nabla_b(FQ^{ab}) = \kappa J^a, \quad (34)$$

$$\nabla_a J^a = 0, \quad (35)$$

or in the dual form

$$2\nabla_{[a}Q_{b]} = -\kappa J_{ab}, \quad (36)$$

$$\nabla_a(F^{-2}Q^a) = 0, \quad (37)$$

$$\nabla_{[a}J_{bc]} = 0. \quad (38)$$

To proceed it is evident that we must compute the axial matter current vector J^a . To this end we assume that one of the eigenvectors of the matter space metric, e_3^a say, is aligned with the axisymmetry generator on the background, *i.e.*

$$e_3^a = F^{-1/2}\eta^a. \quad (39)$$

It is worth pointing out that we hereby restrict ourselves to the case when the Killing vector is space-like, but that no loss of generality is implied in the spherically symmetric background case. Up to this point the discussion has been valid (with appropriate changes of terminology) to background spacetimes admitting any hyper-surface orthogonal Killing vector.

To find J^a we project (16) with $\perp^{ab}\eta^c$ and use the relation

$$\delta \perp^{ab} = -g^{ac}g^{bd}\gamma_{cd}, \quad (40)$$

so that, after some algebra,

$$\eta^c T_{bc}\delta \perp^{ab} = -p_3\eta^c \perp^{ab}\gamma_{bc}, \quad (41)$$

$$\perp^{ab}\eta^c\delta T_{bc} = n_3^{-2}(\rho + p_3) \left(-u^a u^b + \sum_{\mu=1}^2 e_\mu^a e_\mu^b v_{\mu\perp 3}^2 \right) (\delta k_{bc} - n_3^2 \gamma_{bc}) + p_3\eta^c \perp^{ab}\gamma_{bc} \quad (42)$$

$$= (\rho + p_3)FS^{ab}K_b - \eta^c T_{bc}\delta \perp^{ab}, \quad (43)$$

where S^{ab} is the “metric”

$$S^{ab} = -u^a u^b + \sum_{\mu=1}^2 v_{\mu\perp 3}^2 e_\mu^a e_\mu^b, \quad (44)$$

and K_a is the gauge invariant (vanishing when unperturbed) quantity

$$K_a = (Fn_3^2)^{-1} \delta(\perp_a{}^b \eta^c k_{bc}) = (Fn_3^2)^{-1} \perp_a{}^b \eta^c (\delta k_{bc} - n_3^2 \gamma_{bc}) = (Fn_3^2)^{-1} \perp_a{}^b \eta^c \delta k_{bc} - \delta \mu_a. \quad (45)$$

Combining terms we finally find,

$$J^a = 2(\rho + p_3)FS^{ab}K_b. \quad (46)$$

The tensor S^{ab} is vaguely analogous to the so called acoustic metric (sometimes denoted G_{ab}) used in *e.g.* the study of analogues of black holes in fluid mechanics in the sense that it is related to the propagation of waves (although, in this case, it is shear waves rather than sound waves).

We still need to evaluate K_a . We therefore make the very natural choice that the matter space is axisymmetric³ and introduce material space coordinates $(\tilde{x}^i, \tilde{\phi})$, $i = 1, 2$, such that

$$\eta^a \nabla_a \tilde{x}^i = 0, \quad \eta^a \nabla_a \tilde{\phi} = 1. \quad (47)$$

We also assume that the pull-back of the material space metric takes the form

$$k_{ab} = \sum_{i,j} K_{ij} \nabla_a \tilde{x}^i \nabla_b \tilde{x}^j + \tilde{F} \nabla_a \tilde{\phi} \nabla_b \tilde{\phi}, \quad (48)$$

where the metric components K_{ij} and $\tilde{F}$ depend on $\tilde{x}^i$ only. Contracting this relation twice with e_3^a we find that the function $\tilde{F}$ may be expressed as

$$\tilde{F} = F e_3^a e_3^b k_{ab} = F n_3^2, \quad (49)$$

which holds on the background. This allows us to evaluate K_a to be

$$K_a = \nabla_a \delta \tilde{\phi} - \delta \mu_a. \quad (50)$$

We may note in passing that an equivalent form of the perturbation equations may be found directly in terms of the gauge invariant one-form K_a . The equations of motion are then

$$\nabla_b (F \nabla^{[b} K^{a]}) = \kappa(\rho + p_3)FS^{ab}K_b, \quad (51)$$

together with $\nabla_a J^a = 0$ with J^a given in terms of K_a by (46). We shall, however, not pursue this form further.

3.1 Spherically symmetric background

We shall now specialise the equations further by assuming that the background is spherically symmetric. To ease the presentation we start by introducing some notation. As much as possible we shall use the notation of Paper II [17] in this series. The background metric will be decomposed as,

$$g_{ab} = j_{ab} + t_{ab}, \quad (52)$$

where t_{ab} is the metric on the hyper-surfaces spanned by the $SO(3)$ -generators and is taken to be represented by the line element

$$ds_t^2 = r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2), \quad (53)$$

where r is the Schwarzschild radius. Introducing the shorthand notation $r^a = e_1^a$, the orthogonal two dimensional Lorentzian metric is given by

$$j_{ab} = -u_a u_b + r_a r_b, \quad (54)$$

³One could, in principle, consider a non-axisymmetric matter space and constrain the mapping in such a way that spacetime is still axisymmetric. This feels highly unnatural, however, and we will not consider it further.

and the associated volume form is

$$\epsilon_{ab} = -2u_{[a}r_{b]} \quad (55)$$

The covariant derivative operator associated with j_{ab} will be denoted by $\mathcal{D}_a$. Since the angular background eigenvectors will now correspond to degenerate eigenvalues we may further introduce the notation for the basis indices,

$$\mu = 1 \rightarrow \mu = r, \quad \mu \in \{2, 3\} \rightarrow \mu = t, \quad (56)$$

that is, for example

$$p_1 = p_r, \quad p_2 = p_3 = p_t. \quad (57)$$

We now proceed to separate out the angular dependence from our perturbations equations. The discussion will be very brief and the reader is again referred to [14] for details.

Using the dual form of the perturbation equations it is evident from the closedness of J_{ab} expressed in (38) that we may introduce the vector potential Y_a according to

$$J_{ab} = 2\nabla_{[a}Y_{b]}. \quad (58)$$

Furthermore, this vector can be taken to be orthogonal to the $\text{SO}(3)$ -generators. Proceeding to equation (36) it is seen that

$$Q_a = \nabla_a \Phi - \kappa Y_a \quad (59)$$

for some axisymmetric scalar Φ . Separation is achieved by putting

$$\Phi = C(\theta)r\psi, \quad Y_a = C(\theta)\epsilon_{ab}\mathcal{J}^b. \quad (60)$$

The vector $\mathcal{J}^a$ is a two-dimensional object related to J^a by

$$J^a = (r^2 \sin \theta)^{-1} [C'(\theta)\mathcal{J}^a - C(\theta)\mathcal{J}(\partial/\partial\theta)^a], \quad (61)$$

for the two-scalar $\mathcal{J}$ constrained by (35) to take the value $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{D}_a \mathcal{J}^a$. It is convenient to introduce the invariantly defined mass function m through

$$1 - \frac{2m}{r} = \mathcal{D}_a r \mathcal{D}^a r, \quad (62)$$

as well as the function τ invariantly defined on spherically symmetric spacetimes by

$$R^a{}_b \eta^b = \frac{1}{2} \kappa \tau \eta^a, \quad (63)$$

i.e. $\frac{1}{2} \kappa \tau$ is the eigenvalue of the Ricci tensor with respect to the eigenvector η^a . A clearer physical interpretation is seen from the background Einstein equations which implies that τ is the minus the trace of the 2×2 block of the energy momentum tensor orthogonal to the $\text{SO}(3)$ -orbits. In the present case that is

$$\tau = \rho - p_r \quad (64)$$

Noting also the relation

$$r \mathcal{D}^a \mathcal{D}_a r = \frac{2m}{r} - \frac{1}{2} \kappa r^2 \tau \quad (65)$$

the perturbation equations can straight forwardly be confirmed to reduce to the two-dimensional equations

$$(\mathcal{D}_a \mathcal{D}^a - U)\psi = \kappa S \quad (66)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_a \mathcal{J}^a = \mathcal{J}, \quad (67)$$

where

$$S = r \epsilon^{ab} \mathcal{D}_a (r^{-2} \mathcal{J}_b), \quad (68)$$

and the potential U is given by

$$U = \frac{1}{2}\kappa\tau - \frac{6m}{r^3} + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2}, \quad (69)$$

where l is the usual harmonic index coming from the separation of variables. The angular equation is solved by setting

$$C(\theta) = G_{l+2}^{-3/2}(\cos\theta) \quad (70)$$

where $G_{l+2}^{-3/2}(y)$ is an ultra-spherical (or Gegenbauer) polynomial.

In our case J^a is given in terms of background fields and K_a , where, as implied by eq. (50),

$$2\nabla_{[a}K_{b]} = -2\nabla_{[a}\delta\mu_{b]} = -Q_{ab}. \quad (71)$$

This means that $\delta\mu_a$ must be of the form

$$\delta\mu_a = -\frac{C'(\theta)}{(l+2)(l-1)r^2\sin^3\theta}\epsilon_a{}^b\mathcal{Q}_b + \nabla_a f_G \quad (l \geq 2) \quad (72)$$

$$\delta\mu_a = r^{-2}\epsilon_a{}^b\mathcal{Q}_b + \nabla_a f_G \quad (l = 1) \quad (73)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}_a = \mathcal{D}_a(r\psi) - \kappa\epsilon_{ab}\mathcal{J}^b, \quad (74)$$

and f_G is a free function (which we will see in section 6 correspond to the choice of gauge). This in turn implies that K_a must be of the form

$$\begin{aligned} K_a &= \frac{C'(\theta)}{(l+2)(l-1)r^2\sin^3\theta}\epsilon_a{}^b\mathcal{Q}_b + \frac{1}{(l+2)(l-1)}\nabla_a[\sin^{-3}\theta C'(\theta)r^{-1}\varphi] \\ &= \frac{C'(\theta)}{(l+2)(l-1)r^2\sin^3\theta}[\epsilon_a{}^b\mathcal{Q}_b + r^2\mathcal{D}_a(r^{-1}\varphi)] - \frac{C(\theta)}{\sin^3\theta}r^{-1}\varphi\nabla_a\theta, \quad (l \geq 2) \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

$$K_a = r^{-2}\epsilon_a{}^b\mathcal{Q}_b + \mathcal{D}_a(r^{-1}\varphi) \quad (l = 1) \quad (76)$$

for some spherically symmetric scalar φ . Setting

$$\mathcal{S}^{ab} = -u^a u^b + v_{r\perp}^2 r^a r^b, \quad (77)$$

we have

$$\mathcal{S}^{ab} = \mathcal{S}^{ab} + v_{t\perp}^2 e_2^a e_2^b. \quad (78)$$

For $l \geq 2$ we then find

$$\begin{aligned} J^a &= 2(\rho + p_t)FS^{ab}K_b \\ &= \frac{2(\rho + p_t)}{\sin\theta} \left\{ \frac{C'(\theta)}{(l+2)(l-1)}\mathcal{S}^{ab}[\epsilon_a{}^b\mathcal{Q}_b + r^2\mathcal{D}_a(r^{-1}\varphi)] - C(\theta)v_{t\perp}^2 r^{-1}\varphi(\partial/\partial\theta)^a \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Comparing with eq. (61), we obtain

$$[\mathcal{E}\mathcal{S}^a{}_b + (l+2)(l-1)j^a{}_b]\kappa\mathcal{J}^b = \mathcal{E}\mathcal{S}^{ab}[\epsilon_b{}^c\mathcal{D}_c(r\psi) + r^2\mathcal{D}_b(r^{-1}\varphi)] \quad (80)$$

$$\kappa\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{E}v_{t\perp}^2 r^{-1}\varphi \quad (81)$$

where

$$\mathcal{E} = 2\kappa r^2(\rho + p_t). \quad (82)$$

Solving for $\kappa\mathcal{J}^a$ we find

$$\kappa\mathcal{J}^a = (-C_0 u^a u^b + C_1 r^a r^b)[\epsilon_b{}^c\mathcal{D}_c(r\psi) + r^2\mathcal{D}_b(r^{-1}\varphi)] \quad (83)$$

where

$$C_0 = \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\mathcal{E} + (l+2)(l-1)} \quad (84)$$

$$C_1 = \frac{\mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2}{\mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2 + (l+2)(l-1)}. \quad (85)$$

When $l = 1$ a similar analysis shows that $\mathcal{J} = 0$ and that $\mathcal{J}^a$ is given by the expression (83) with

$$C_0 = \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\mathcal{E} + 1} \quad (86)$$

$$C_1 = \frac{\mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2}{\mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2 + 1}. \quad (87)$$

Finally, rewriting the perturbation equations (66)-(67) in terms of the quantity $\mathcal{Q}_a$ defined in (74), we find

$$r\mathcal{D}^a(r^{-2}\mathcal{Q}_a) = \frac{(l+2)(l-1)}{r^2}\psi, \quad (88)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_a\mathcal{J}^a = \mathcal{J}, \quad (89)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_a$, $\mathcal{J}^a$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are given in terms of the two-dimensional scalar fields ψ and φ in eqs. (74), (83) and (81) respectively. These equations are valid for any $l \geq 1$ provided one remember to put $\mathcal{J} = 0$ when $l = 1$. The non-radiative nature of the $l = 1$ case is hinted by the form of the equations which are just decoupled conservation equations for the two “currents” $r^{-2}\mathcal{Q}^a$ and $\mathcal{J}^a$.

In order to better understand the content of these equations it is useful to write them out in a suitable coordinate system. For brevity we will from now on only consider the radiative case $l \geq 2$. It is advantageous to use explicitly conformally flat coordinates given by

$$u_a = -e^\nu(dt)_a, \quad r_a = e^\nu(dr_*)_a. \quad (90)$$

which will reduce to the usual Regge-Wheeler radial gauge on static backgrounds. Next we introduce the notation

$$\mathcal{X}_t = u_a\mathcal{X}^a, \quad \mathcal{X}_r = r_a\mathcal{X}^a \quad (91)$$

for any $\mathcal{X}^a$. Then we have

$$\kappa\mathcal{J}_t = e^{-\nu}C_0 \left[(r\psi)' + r^2(r^{-1}\varphi)^\cdot \right] \quad (92)$$

$$\kappa\mathcal{J}_r = e^{-\nu}C_1 \left[(r\psi)^\cdot + r^2(r^{-1}\varphi)' \right] \quad (93)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_t = e^{-\nu} \left[(1 - C_1)(r\psi)^\cdot - C_1r^2(r^{-1}\varphi)' \right] \quad (94)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_r = e^{-\nu} \left[(1 - C_0)(r\psi)' - C_0r^2(r^{-1}\varphi)^\cdot \right] \quad (95)$$

$$(96)$$

where dots and primes denotes derivatives with respect to t and r_* respectively⁴. Using

$$\mathcal{W}_t = r^{-1}e^\nu\mathcal{Q}_t, \quad \mathcal{W}_r = r^{-1}e^\nu\mathcal{Q}_r \quad (97)$$

⁴This notation should not be confused with the use of dots and primes in Paper II [17].

as auxiliary variables we can cast the perturbation equations as a first order system,

$$-\dot{\mathcal{W}}_t + \mathcal{W}'_r + \frac{\dot{r}}{r}\mathcal{W}_t - \frac{r'}{r}\mathcal{W}_r - e^{2\nu}\frac{L}{r^2}\psi = 0 \quad (98)$$

$$-\dot{\mathcal{W}}_r + \mathcal{W}'_t - \frac{\dot{r}}{r}\mathcal{W}_r + \frac{r'}{r}\mathcal{W}_t + e^{2\nu}\frac{\mathcal{E}v_{t\perp}^2}{r^2}\varphi = 0 \quad (99)$$

$$-L(r\psi)' + \mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2 r^2(r^{-1}\varphi)' + (\mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2 + L)r\mathcal{W}_t = 0 \quad (100)$$

$$L(r\psi)' - \mathcal{E}r^2(r^{-1}\varphi)' - (\mathcal{E} + L)r\mathcal{W}_r = 0 \quad (101)$$

where $L = (l+2)(l-1)$ and we have used the definitions of C_0 (84) and C_1 (85). We may note here that the principal part of these equations decouple into two systems, one in ψ and φ which has a characteristic propagation speed $v_{r\perp}^2$ and one in $\mathcal{W}_t$ and $\mathcal{W}_r$ whose speed is 1. We may naturally interpret this as the existence of two families of modes, the shear modes and the axial gravitational w -modes.

This is as far as we go in the general case. Note that this system is suitable for numerical integration since it does not contain derivatives of background quantities that can be discontinuous. As we will see below, it also makes maximal use of the junction conditions so that $\mathcal{W}_t$, $\mathcal{W}_r$ and ψ are all everywhere continuous.

4 Static background

The above derived system (98) - (101) of equations is valid for any spherically symmetric background and could therefore be applied to *e.g.* collapsing bodies. However since our interest here lies on matter with non-zero shear modulus such configurations are not realistic (since the strain would inevitably grow beyond the breaking strain of the material). One could of course study axial perturbations of a radially oscillating star, but henceforth we will restrict our attention to the case where the background is static. We can then drop all dotted background quantities. It is then possible to combine (98) - (100) to give a wave equation for $\mathcal{W}_t$ sourced by φ . In addition the equations (99) - (101) can be combined into a wave equation for φ with $\mathcal{W}_t$ as a source;

$$\begin{aligned} -\ddot{\mathcal{W}}_t + \mathcal{W}_t'' + e^{2\nu} \left(\frac{6m}{r^3} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\rho - p_r) - \frac{\mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2}{r^2} - \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \right) \mathcal{W}_t \\ = r \left[\frac{e^{2\nu}\mathcal{E}(v_{r\perp}^2 - v_{t\perp}^2)}{r^3} \varphi \right]' - \left[\frac{e^{2\nu}\mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2}{r^2} \right]' \varphi \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

$$-\ddot{\varphi} + \frac{(\mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2\varphi')'}{\mathcal{E}} - \left[\frac{(\mathcal{E}v_{r\perp}^2 r')'}{\mathcal{E}r} + e^{2\nu}\frac{v_{t\perp}^2(\mathcal{E} + L)}{r^2} \right] \varphi = \frac{[\mathcal{E}(1 - v_{r\perp}^2)r\mathcal{W}_t]'}{\mathcal{E}r} - \frac{\mathcal{E}'}{\mathcal{E}}\mathcal{W}_t \quad (103)$$

Of course, many possible reformulations exist of this system of equations if new dependent variables are chosen. One such reformulation would have been to choose ψ instead of $\mathcal{W}_t$ as the first dependent variable. This would have followed the general guidelines in [14] more closely, but would not have lead to simplified formulae in this case. We do not feel that any possible second order system reformulation (that we have found) is superior in any important ways to (102)-(103). In any case, for numerical integration it is preferable to use the first order system (98)-(101). We could also give more explicit expressions of the terms involving derivatives of background quantities by making use of the results of Paper I. However, either one then keeps the elastic equation of state free in which case third order partial derivatives of the energy per particle will appear, or one specify *e.g.* a quasi-Hookean equation of state leading to rather lengthy expressions. We do not feel that this leads to any further understanding of the problem at hand. Instead we give explicit expressions below suitable for numerical integration. We shall therefore be satisfied with this form of the wave equations and pause a moment to discuss some of their properties.

First, it is clear that for vacuum (103) is trivial and (102) is just the usual Regge-Wheeler equation. For this reason we may refer to (102) as the gravitational wave equation. Second, if we take the isotropic limit we have $v_{r\perp}^2 = v_{t\perp}^2 = 2\kappa r^2 \tilde{\mu} \mathcal{E}^{-1}$, where $\tilde{\mu}$ is the shear modulus, so that the source terms in (102) reduce to

$$2\kappa(e^{2\nu}\tilde{\mu})'\varphi \quad (104)$$

so that we see that, as pointed out by Dyson [11], for weak gravity, $e^\nu \approx 1 \approx \text{constant}$, gravitational waves couple only to the gradient of the shear modulus. Another important case is the perfect fluid limit. Here we see that the system reduces to

$$-\ddot{\mathcal{W}}_t + \mathcal{W}_t'' + e^{2\nu} \left(\frac{6m}{r^3} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\rho - p) - \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \right) \mathcal{W}_t = 0 \quad (105)$$

$$-r\varphi^{\cdot\cdot} = (r\mathcal{W}_t)' \quad (106)$$

The first of these equations is the standard result, see *e.g.* [7, 8, 18]. The second equation is now redundant since the variable φ does not encode any relevant physical information in this case⁵. It is in fact easy to show, using (92)-(94) and (106), that the two dimensional matter current $\mathcal{J}^a$ satisfy $\mathcal{J}_r = 0$, $\dot{\mathcal{J}}_t = 0$ so that the well known result that axial perturbations of perfect fluids reduce to stationary currents is evident.

4.1 Boundary conditions

The perturbation equations must be accompanied by suitable boundary conditions. These conditions were treated in detail by Karlovini for general matter sources [14] and we merely state the results here; At any boundary (including *e.g.* interfaces between different layers or the surface) we require that the one-form $\mathcal{Q}_a$ as well as the scalar ψ should be continuous. These conditions follow from the requirement that the first and second fundamental form on any hyper-surface with normal n^a (say) are continuous. In particular this implies that the traction $n^a T_{ab}$ is continuous as well [20]. In ST the condition of continuous traction was enforced as an additional constraint. In view of the above it is clear that this is only necessary as a gauge condition relating the gauges on either side of the hyper-surface. An additional boundary condition is provided by requiring regularity at the centre. Finally, if we consider an isolated object, we need to impose a condition of outgoing gravitational waves at infinity. We discuss these boundary conditions in more detail in the next section where we give a computational recipe for quasi normal mode solutions to the perturbation equations.

5 Computational algorithm

We shall here present a procedure for finding quasi-normal mode solutions to the perturbation equations in situations relevant for neutron stars with a fluid core, a solid crust and, possibly, a fluid ocean. We therefore assume harmonic time dependence, *i.e.* that the temporal dependence of the independent variables is given by $e^{i\omega t}$. We have found it slightly preferable to present the equations in Schwarzschild coordinates, related to the Regge-Wheeler coordinates through

$$e^\nu dr_* = e^\lambda dr \quad (107)$$

where λ is given by

$$e^{-2\lambda} = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} \quad (108)$$

When we wish to solve our perturbation equations numerically it is preferable that all variables scale with the same power of r near the centre. To obtain this behaviour (as well as some other features) we redefine the variables in the system (98)-(101) (specialised to a static background) according to

$$\mathcal{X}_1 = r^{-l-1} \mathcal{W}_t \quad (109)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_2 = -i\omega_0 r^{-l} \mathcal{W}_r \quad (110)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_3 = -i\omega_0 e^\nu r^{-l-1} \psi \quad (111)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_4 = \omega_0^2 e^\nu r^{-l} \varphi \quad (112)$$

⁵The extra equation correspond in a sense to the freedom of choice of mapping between M and X . For perfect fluids the labelling of fluid elements plays no role in the dynamics so there is some degree of degeneracy in defining the map.

where $\omega_0 = e^{-\nu_c} \omega$ and ν_c is the central value of ν . The reason for introducing these variables is that if one wish to solve the background equations simultaneously with the perturbation equations using a shooting algorithm the central value of ν is unknown since it is determined by matching the background solution to the exterior Schwarzschild solution at the surface of the star. The above scaling allows for writing the equations in terms of ω_0 and $\nu_0 = \nu - \nu_c$ and, once the solution is found scale it back to physical units.

It is easy to show that for perfect fluids the last two of the first order equations become algebraic relations amounting to

$$\mathcal{X}_3 = -e^{\nu_0} \mathcal{X}_1, \quad \mathcal{X}_4 = -e^{\nu_0} \mathcal{X}_2 \quad (113)$$

whereas the other two become just

$$r \frac{d\mathcal{X}_1}{dr} = -(l+2)\mathcal{X}_1 - e^{\lambda-\nu_0} \mathcal{X}_2 \quad (114)$$

$$r \frac{d\mathcal{X}_2}{dr} = -e^{\lambda-\nu_0} [Le^{2\nu_0} - \omega_0^2 r^2] \mathcal{X}_1 - (l-1)\mathcal{X}_2 \quad (115)$$

Disregarding the singular solution scaling as r^{-2l-1} near $r = 0$ it is easy to see that the variables leave the centre according to

$$\mathcal{X}_1 = \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1 + O(r^2) \quad (116)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_2 = -(l+2)\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1 + O(r^2) \quad (117)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_3 = \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1 + O(r^2) \quad (118)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_4 = -(l+2)\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1 + O(r^2) \quad (119)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1$ is an arbitrary constant. The equations in a solid becomes,

$$r \frac{d\mathcal{X}_1}{dr} = -(l+2)\mathcal{X}_1 - e^{\lambda-\nu_0} \mathcal{X}_2 - e^\lambda \frac{\mathcal{E} v_{t\perp}^2}{r^2 \omega_0^2} \mathcal{X}_4 \quad (120)$$

$$r \frac{d\mathcal{X}_2}{dr} = e^{\lambda-\nu_0} \omega_0^2 r^2 \mathcal{X}_1 - (l-1)\mathcal{X}_2 + e^\lambda L \mathcal{X}_3 \quad (121)$$

$$r \frac{d\mathcal{X}_3}{dr} = e^\lambda \frac{\mathcal{E} + L}{L} \mathcal{X}_2 + [r\nu_{,r} - (l+2)] \mathcal{X}_3 + e^{\lambda-\nu_0} \frac{\mathcal{E}}{L} \mathcal{X}_4 \quad (122)$$

$$\mathcal{E} v_{r\perp}^2 r \frac{d\mathcal{X}_4}{dr} = -e^\lambda r^2 \omega_0^2 [\mathcal{E} v_{r\perp}^2 + L] \mathcal{X}_1 - e^{\lambda-\nu_0} r^2 \omega_0^2 L \mathcal{X}_3 + \mathcal{E} v_{r\perp}^2 [r\nu_{,r} - (l-1)] \mathcal{X}_4 \quad (123)$$

where

$$\nu_{,r} = \frac{d\nu}{dr} = \frac{m + \frac{1}{2}\kappa r^3 p_r}{r(r-2m)} \quad (124)$$

and the shear wave speeds depend on the equation of state according to (17). For the quasi-Hookean equation of state discussed in Paper I they take the form

$$\mathcal{E} v_{r\perp}^2 = \kappa \tilde{\mu} r^2 \left[1 + \frac{n_t^2}{n_r^2} \right] \quad (125)$$

$$\mathcal{E} v_{t\perp}^2 = 2\kappa \tilde{\mu} r^2 \left[\frac{n_t^2}{n_r^2} + \frac{n_r^2}{n_t^2} - 1 \right] \quad (126)$$

In vacuum the equations are

$$\mathcal{X}_3 = -e^{\nu_0} \mathcal{X}_1, \quad \mathcal{X}_4 = \text{unconstrained} \quad (127)$$

$$r \frac{d\mathcal{X}_1}{dr} = -(l+2)\mathcal{X}_1 - \frac{r e^{\nu_c}}{r-2M} \mathcal{X}_2 \quad (128)$$

$$r \frac{d\mathcal{X}_2}{dr} = -e^{-\nu_c} \left[L - \frac{e^{2\nu_c} \omega_0^2 r^3}{r-2M} \right] \mathcal{X}_1 - (l-1)\mathcal{X}_2 \quad (129)$$

where M is the total mass of the star.

Using the expansion (116)-(119) we may now integrate the fluid equations to the crust core interface, where we need to impose the boundary conditions. In the present variables these are just the continuity of $\mathcal{X}_1$, $\mathcal{X}_2$ and $\mathcal{X}_3$. Note that $\mathcal{X}_4$ is free at the boundary and can in principle be set to any value. However, as we proceed with the integration in the solid we eventually encounter the next boundary. If this boundary is an interface to a fluid phase or vacuum we have two conditions on the variable $\mathcal{X}_3$, i) it must be continuous and ii) it has to satisfy the constraint (113) (which is identical to (127) in the vacuum case). In general these will not be satisfied signalling the wrong choice of value of $\mathcal{X}_4$ at the previous boundary. The remedy to this situation is to find a second independent solution to the equation in the solid phase and then to take the linear combination of the two solutions which satisfy all the boundary conditions. The simplest way to find the second solution is to start with $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2 = \mathcal{X}_3 = 0$ and $\mathcal{X}_4 = \text{any value}$. Clearly, adding any multiple of this solution to the original one will not violate the initial boundary conditions so it is a simple task of solving an algebraic equation to find the correct total solution in this part of the star. It should be evident how to work out the entire solution to the problem using this algorithm regardless of the number of interfaces in the star. Finally, the quasi-normal mode frequencies ω are determined by making sure that the vacuum solution is described by outgoing gravitational waves. This specifies the solutions up to a scale.

6 Identifying the metric and the strain

Since neither the metric nor the strain on a strained background is gauge invariant we need to specify the gauge in order to evaluate them. We have already used some of our gauge freedom by setting $\delta\eta^a = 0$, so any further gauge transformation has to be generated by a vector field, ζ^a say, that is Lie-dragged by the axisymmetry generator,

$$\mathcal{L}_\eta \zeta^a = -\mathcal{L}_\zeta \eta^a = 0 \quad (130)$$

We may decompose ζ^a according to

$$\zeta^a = \zeta_\perp^a + f_G \eta^a, \quad \zeta_\perp^a \eta_a = 0, \quad \eta^a \nabla_a f_G = 0 \quad (131)$$

Now, since

$$\mathcal{L}_{\zeta_\perp} \mu_a = 0 \quad (132)$$

due to the fact that η^a is a hyper-surface orthogonal Killing vector on the background it is clear that gauge transformations generated by a vector field orthogonal to, and Lie-dragged by η^a does not affect the axial perturbations. Likewise, it is easy to show that a gauge transformation of the type $\zeta^a = f_G \eta^a$ does not affect the polar perturbations. Hence we need only consider gauge transformations of the latter type. Under such a transformation we have

$$\delta\mu_a \rightarrow \delta\mu_a + \nabla_a f_G, \quad (133)$$

$$\delta\tilde{\phi} \rightarrow \delta\tilde{\phi} + f_G. \quad (134)$$

Since $\eta^a \nabla_a \delta\tilde{\phi} = 0$ we may use this freedom to set $\delta\tilde{\phi} = 0^6$. This gauge choice is of a comoving, or Lagrangian type and is the natural way to measure the strain since *e.g.* the breaking strain will invariably be calculated in a comoving frame. We thus find that in a Lagrangian gauge we have $\Delta\tilde{\phi} = 0$ so that $f_G = -\delta\tilde{\phi}$ and $\Delta\mu_a = -K_a$, where we use Δ to indicate that a special gauge has been chosen. Using these relations we find

$$\Delta s_{ab} = -\eta_{(a} K_{b)} + u_{(a} \Delta u_{b)} = -\eta_{(a} h_{b)}^c K_c. \quad (135)$$

The perturbed metric is just

$$\Delta g_{ab} = -2\eta_{(a} K_{b)} \quad (136)$$

⁶Note that Schumaker and Thorne uses the gauge freedom to set the θ -component of $\delta\mu_a = 0$. This would correspond to setting $f_G = \text{constant}$. It is also worth pointing out that, since these authors consider isotropic backgrounds, their perturbed strain tensor is gauge invariant.

and

$$\Delta k^a{}_b = 2k_{bc}\eta^{(c}K^a). \quad (137)$$

Usually estimates of the breaking, or yield, strain is given as a dimensionless strain angle, $\Theta_{\max}$ say. The precise relation to the components of the strain tensor depends on the type of deformation and the microscopic structure of the solid material. However, for simple (*e.g.* isotropic or cubic) structures under simple deformations (*e.g.* pure twist or shear) the nonzero components of s_{ab} have the form

$$s_{ab} \approx \frac{1}{2}\Theta. \quad (138)$$

Given the uncertainty in the literature on the value of $\Theta_{\max}$ [25] it does not feel meaningful to digress too deeply into the subject of breakdown of elasticity. It is clear that the approximation of perfect elasticity will break down before the material actually cracks, so for all purposes of this paper we may assume that something catastrophic happens when any component of s_{ab} exceeds some value of the order of $\frac{1}{2}\Theta_{\max}$.

An interesting observation is that, even though the first order perturbations of the linear particle densities are all zero, so that the strain scalar also is unperturbed to first order, we may still estimate the second order contribution to the strain scalar and thereby estimate the energy stored in the elastic material. We may namely compute the strain scalar by first evaluating the total

$$k^a{}_b = {}^0k^a{}_b + \Delta k^a{}_b + \Delta^2 k^a{}_b \quad (139)$$

for some unspecified second order perturbation $\Delta^2 k^a{}_b$. Noting that the non-orthogonal pieces will not alter the strain scalar (all such pieces are contracted with orthogonal tensors) and using bold face letters to denote the 3×3 -matrices $\mathbf{k} = h^a{}_c k^c{}_b$ we may write (see Paper I)

$$s^2 = \frac{1}{36 \det \mathbf{k}} [(\text{Tr } \mathbf{k})^3 - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{k}^3) - 24 \det \mathbf{k}] \quad (140)$$

It then turns out (after some straightforward but tedious algebra) that the second order perturbation terms only comes in multiplied by the background strain. These terms will therefore always (due to the small numerical value of the breaking strain) be much smaller than other second order terms. Neglecting them leads to an expression of the form

$$s^2 = s_0^2 + \frac{1}{2} F h^{ab} K_a K_b + \dots \quad (141)$$

where s_0 is the background value.

In summary, once a solution to the perturbation equations are found using the procedure described in section 5 it is easy to find the metric and stress tensor perturbations from equations (136) and (135) respectively. Since the solutions will only be defined up to a scale one may then set this scale such that the largest component of $s_{ab} + \Delta s_{ab}$ is smaller than some maximum value of order $\frac{1}{2}\Theta_{\max}$ to find the maximally allowed amplitude of the perturbations consistent with elastic response. It is also straight forward to estimate the maximal stored elastic energy density by the formula

$$\rho_{\text{elastic}} = \check{\mu} s^2 \quad (142)$$

where $\check{\mu}$ is the shear modulus and s^2 is given by (141).

7 Conclusion

We have developed the general relativistic theory of torsional oscillations in elastic matter. In the light of the recent very exciting observations of quasi-periodic oscillations in the tail of giant flares in soft gamma-ray repeaters, with frequencies matching well the expected spectrum of such modes, we believe that it is important to have a well founded theory for these modes. We have improved on the previously existing theory (mainly ST) in several respects; The equations presented here are gauge invariant and are valid to second order in strain for any equation of state as long as the material is of a conformally deforming type. Various

gauge-issues have been resolved and resulted in simplified equations and boundary conditions compared to ST. The elastic response to perturbations is conveniently parametrised in terms of the shear wave velocities and should be straight forward to apply to the anisotropic “pasta” phases near the crust-core boundary of neutron stars once the relevant elastic parameters have been estimated.

The results of this paper has in fact already been applied in the relativistic Cowling approximation [26]. Although it is expected that the spectrum should not change substantially when gravitational degrees of freedom are included it is nevertheless important to check this numerically and work in that direction is in progress.

Acknowledgements

LS gratefully acknowledge support by a Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship, contract number MEIF-CT-2005-009366. Parts of this work was carried out when the authors were at Stockholm University. We are grateful to Nils Andersson and Brandon Carter for discussion and insightful comments. In the course of this work extensive use was made of the computer algebra package GRTensorII [23] running within Maple. We also acknowledge support from the EU-network ILIAS providing opportunity for valuable discussions with our European colleagues.

References

- [1] Nils Andersson and Gregory L. Comer. Relativistic fluid dynamics: Physics for many different scales. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 10(1), 2007. [gr-qc/0605010](#).
- [2] C. Barat, R. I. Hayles, K. Hurley, M. Niel, G. Vedrenne, U. Desai, V. G. Kurt, V. M. Zenchenko, and I. V. Estulin. Fine time structure in the 1979 March 5 gamma ray burst. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 126:400–402, October 1983.
- [3] B. Carter and H. Quintana. Foundations of general relativistic high pressure elasticity theory. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A*, 331:57, 1972.
- [4] B. Carter and L. Samuelsson. Relativistic mechanics of neutron superfluid in (magneto) elastic star crust. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 23:5367–5388, August 2006. [gr-qc/0605024](#).
- [5] Brandon Carter. Elastic perturbation theory in general relativity and a variation principle for a rotating solid star. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 30:261–286, 1973.
- [6] Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar. *The mathematical theory of black holes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 200 Madison Avenue, New York, 1992.
- [7] Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar and Valeria Ferrari. On the non-radial oscillations of a star. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A*, 432:247, 1991.
- [8] Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar and Valeria Ferrari. On the non-radial oscillations of a star iii. a reconsideration of the axial modes. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A*, 434:449, 1991.
- [9] R. C. Duncan. Global Seismic Oscillations in Soft Gamma Repeaters. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 498:L45+, May 1998.
- [10] R. C. Duncan and C. Thompson. Formation of very strongly magnetized neutron stars - Implications for gamma-ray bursts. *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 392:L9–L13, June 1992.
- [11] Freeman J. Dyson. Seismic response of the earth to a gravitational wave in the 1-hz band. *Astrophys. J.*, 156:529, 1969.

- [12] K. Glampedakis, L. Samuelsson, and N. Andersson. Elastic or magnetic? A toy model for global magnetar oscillations with implications for quasi-periodic oscillations during flares. *Mon. Not. R. Ast. Soc.* , 371:L74–L77, September 2006. [astro-ph/0605461](#).
- [13] G. L. Israel, T. Belloni, L. Stella, Y. Rephaeli, D. E. Gruber, P. Casella, S. Dall’Osso, N. Rea, M. Persic, and R. E. Rothschild. The Discovery of Rapid X-Ray Oscillations in the Tail of the SGR 1806-20 Hyperflare. *Astrophys. J. Lett.* , 628:L53–L56, July 2005. [astro-ph/0505255](#).
- [14] Max Karlovini. Axial perturbations of general spherically symmetric spacetimes. *Class. Quantum Grav.* , 19:2125–2140, 2002. [gr-qc/0111066](#).
- [15] Max Karlovini and Lars Samuelsson. Elastic stars in general relativity: I. Foundations and equilibrium models. *Class. Quantum Grav.* , 20:3613–3648, 2003. [gr-qc/0211026](#).
- [16] Max Karlovini and Lars Samuelsson. Elastic stars in general relativity III. Stiff ultrarigid exact solutions. *Class. Quantum Grav.* , 21:4531–4548, 2004. [gr-qc/0401115](#).
- [17] Max Karlovini, Lars Samuelsson, and Moundheer Zarroug. Elastic stars in general relativity: II. Radial perturbations. *Class. Quantum Grav.* , 21:1559–1581, 2004. [gr-qc/0309056](#).
- [18] K. D. Kokkotas. Axial Modes for Relativistic Stars. *Mon. Not. R. Ast. Soc.* , 268:1015–+, June 1994.
- [19] Y. Levin. QPOs during magnetar flares are not driven by mechanical normal modes of the crust. *Mon. Not. R. Ast. Soc.* , 368:L35–L38, May 2006. [astro-ph/0601020](#).
- [20] M. Mars and J. M. M. Senovilla. Geometry of general hypersurfaces in spacetime: junction conditions . *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 10:1865–1897, September 1993.
- [21] P. N. McDermott, H. M. van Horn, and C. J. Hansen. Nonradial oscillations of neutron stars. *Astrophys. J.* , 325:725–748, February 1988.
- [22] N. Messios, D. B. Papadopoulos, and N. Stergioulas. Torsional oscillations of magnetized relativistic stars. *Mon. Not. R. Ast. Soc.* , 328:1161–1168, December 2001. [astro-ph/0105175](#).
- [23] Peter Musgrave, Denis Pollney, and Kayll Lake. GRTensorII. <http://grtensor.org>.
- [24] C. J. Pethick and D. G. Ravenhall. Matter at large neutron excess and the physics of neutron-star crusts. *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* , 45:429–484, 1995.
- [25] M. Ruderman. Neutron Star Crustal Plate Tectonics. III. Cracking, Glitches, and Gamma-Ray Bursts. *Astrophys. J.* , 382:587–+, December 1991.
- [26] L. Samuelsson and N. Andersson. Neutron star asteroseismology. Axial crust oscillations in the Cowling approximation. *Mon. Not. R. Ast. Soc.* , 374:256–268, January 2007. [astro-ph/069265](#).
- [27] Bonny L. Schumaker and Kip S. Thorne. Torsional modes of neutron stars. *Mon. Not. R. Ast. Soc.* , 203:457, 1983.
- [28] H. Sotani, K. D. Kokkotas, and N. Stergioulas. Torsional oscillations of relativistic stars with dipole magnetic fields. *Mon. Not. R. Ast. Soc.* , 375:261–277, February 2007. [astro-ph/0608626](#).
- [29] H. Sotani, K. D. Kokkotas, N. Stergioulas, and M. Vavoulidis. Torsional Oscillations of Relativistic Stars with Dipole Magnetic Fields II. Global Alfvén Modes. *ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints*, November 2006. [astro-ph/0611666](#).
- [30] T. E. Strohmayer and A. L. Watts. Discovery of Fast X-Ray Oscillations during the 1998 Giant Flare from SGR 1900+14. *Astrophys. J. Lett.* , 632:L111–L114, October 2005. [astro-ph/0508206](#).

- [31] T. E. Strohmayer and A. L. Watts. The 2004 Hyperflare from SGR 1806-20: Further Evidence for Global Torsional Vibrations. *Astrophys. J.* , 653:593–601, December 2006. [astro-ph/0608463](#).
- [32] Robert M. Wald. *General Relativity*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984.
- [33] A. L. Watts and T. E. Strohmayer. Detection with RHESSI of High-Frequency X-Ray Oscillations in the Tail of the 2004 Hyperflare from SGR 1806-20. *Astrophys. J. Lett.* , 637:L117–L120, February 2006. [astro-ph/0512630](#).